



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,810	02/08/2005	Yoshio Abe	265615US3PCT	1565
22850 7590 02/27/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER SEVER, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT 2851	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/27/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/523,810	Applicant(s) ABE, YOSHIO	
	Examiner ANDREW T. SEVER	Art Unit 2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriguchi et al. (US 4,509,823 as cited in the previous office actions) in view of Ookawa et al. (US 2004/0075897.)

Moriguchi teaches in figure 1 a lenticular lens sheet manufactured by the method of roll printing (see column 10 lines 37-47 of Moriguchi), said lenticular lens comprises a plurality of lenticular lenses (figure 1 part 2 of Moriguchi, there are a plurality of identical unlabeled convex lenses situated next to convex lens 2) on a first surface of a translucent substrate (material that the part 1 of figure 1 of Moriguchi is made of), so that each lenticular lens has a longest dimension in a lenticular lens longitudinal direction (not shown in Moriguchi), and convex external light-absorbing sections disposed on a second surface of the translucent substrate at positions different from condensing positions in which light from the lenticular lenses is condensed (part 7 is light absorbing sections that is situated between the positions where light from the lenticular lenses 2 is condensed which is at 5 as indicated by the arrows A in figure 1, all of Moriguchi); and

Forming an external light-absorbing layer on the slant surfaces of the external light-absorbing sections (part 4 of Moriguchi is slanted and the light absorbing material layer 7 is formed thereon);

Wherein the external light-absorbing layer is formed by roll printing (see column 10 lines 37-47 of Moriguchi.)

Moriguchi does not teach that the roll printing is performed by rotating a printing roll in a forward direction with the lenticular lens longitudinal direction being parallel to the feeding direction.

Ookawa teaches in figure 10 a machine for manufacturing among other things lenticular lens sheets which as shown in figure 5 includes light-absorbing layers. As shown in figure 7 the roller used in manufacturing the lenses is designed so that when the roll printing is performed by rotating the printing roll in a forward direction and said roll printing using a feeding direction of the lenticular lens substrate being printed on that is parallel to the lenticular lens longitudinal direction on the lenticular lens substrate.

Ookawa teaches in paragraph 20 that by using the manufacturing method of Ookawa a lenticular lens sheet can be produced that has no optical defects. Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Ookawa to manufacture the convex external light-absorbing sections of the lenticular lens sheet of Moriguchi as it would result in a better lens sheet with no (or less) optical defects.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Ookawa relates only to forming lenticular lenses using a mold, which differs from disclosed invention; specifically applicant argues on page 4 that Ookawa is specifically directed towards making the lens sheet rather than putting the light absorbing compound on the lens sheet. With regards to the actual details of the product (the lenticular lens sheet with lenticular lenses and light-absorbing layer), this is taught by Moriguchi as outlined above, which further teaches in column 10 lines 37-47 that they are manufactured by roll printing; therefore applicant's arguments with regards to the product manufactured by Ookawa are irrelevant since the claimed product is taught by Moriguchi. With regards to the method of manufacturing as taught by Ookawa which is disclosed as being a form of roll printing (it uses a roller as shown in figure 7 which would make it roll printing), while the method of Ookawa may differ from applicant's disclosed invention with regards to the specific molds and activation energy curing composition (see page 3 of applicant's arguments) applicant has not claimed either the mold or lack thereof, applicant has only claimed that the lens sheet taught by Moriguchi is manufactured by a method using rollers and applicant has claimed the direction in which the lens sheet is fed through the machine doing the manufacturing, since this is taught by Ookawa and is taught to result in less or no optical defects as outlined in the

rejection of claim 5 above; applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. Applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references (see *In re Keller* 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981)) and although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims (see *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW T. SEVER whose telephone number is (571)272-2128. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diane Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew T Sever/ 2/18/2008
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2851